


their recognized divergent subject matter is respectfully traversed and submitted to be unsupported on the present record. Therefore, to the extent that the restriction requirement relies on this assertion, it is respectfully submitted that the restriction requirement is improper and should be withdrawn.

The restriction requirement with respect to the claims in Groups I, II and III is further traversed. The Office Action asserts that "Inventions I, II, III are unrelated." The Office Action further asserts that the "Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01)." Applicant traverses these assertions. Applicant respectfully submits that the Office Action fails to show that the claims of Groups I, II or III are unrelated. Moreover, the Office Action fails to show that the claims of Groups I, II or III are not disclosed as being capable of use together. Accordingly, the restriction requirement with respect to the claims of Groups I, II and III is improper.

In addition, requirements for restriction are not mandatory under 35 U.S.C. Accordingly, reconsideration of the restriction requirement is requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Daniel M. Fitzgerald  
Registration No. 38,880  
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP  
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600  
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740  
(314) 621-5070